

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case:2:19-cr-20540

Judge: Steeh, George Caram

MJ: Whalen, R. Steven

Filed: 08-21-2019 At 11:25 AM

INFO USA V DAVID STRAND (LG)

VS.

Offense/Violation:

Wire Fraud – 18 U.S.C. §1343

D-1 DAVID STRAND,

D	efei	ndan	ıt

Plaintiff,

INFORMATION

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY CHARGES:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

That at all times pertinent to this information:

- 1. Ascentium Capital LLC [Ascentium], was a company which, among other things, provided financing for equipment and technology.
- 2. Mountaineer Leasing did business in Auburn Hills, Michigan, and elsewhere under the name "Wholesale Truck and Finance" [WTF], and was founded by D-1 DAVID STRAND [STRAND] in April 2008.
 - 3. In June 2013, Ascentium purchased WTF, which agreed to keep

STRAND on as president of the company in order to run WTF after the purchase.

COUNT ONE: WIRE FRAUD (18 U.S.C. §1343: D-1 David Strand)

- 1. The General Allegations are included in this count;
- 2. Beginning in 2013 and continuing through 2015, in the Eastern

 District of Michigan, Southern Division, D-1 DAVID STRAND, defendant, did, having devised a scheme to defraud and to obtain money from Ascentium by means of material false and fraudulent pretenses and representations, and for the purpose of executing that scheme, cause the transmission of writings, signs and signals by means of wire and radio transmission in interstate commerce;
- 3. The object of the scheme to defraud and to obtain money by false and fraudulent pretenses and representations was to obtain money from Ascentium based on STRAND's false material representations to Ascentium that funds he requested from Ascentium as the president of WTF were to be used for the purchase of road-ready trucks when, in fact, the amounts requested were either (1) inflated, with the inflated prices supported by false and fraudulent, marked-up invoices; (2) for the purchase of trucks that were not operational contrary to STRAND's representations; or (3) for payment of entirely fictitious transactions (supported by false vehicle identification numbers submitted to Ascentium).

4. On or about March 30, 2015, in the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, STRAND did, for the purpose of executing the above-described scheme to defraud and obtain money by false and fraudulent pretenses, cause the transfer of \$107,312.31, by means of interstate wire transmission, from East-West Bank, Houston, Texas to Chase Bank, Auburn Hills, Michigan.

FORFEITURE ALLEGATIONS (18 U.S.C. § 982, 981 and 28 U.S.C. § 2461 – Criminal Forfeiture)

- 1. Upon being convicted of violating Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343 as charged in this Information, the convicted defendant shall forfeit to the United States any property which constitutes, or is derived from, proceeds obtained directly or indirectly as a result of such violation(s), pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C), Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461, and/or Title 18, United States Code, Section 982(a)(2).
- 2. <u>Money Judgment</u>: Upon being convicted of violating Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 as charged in this Information, the convicted defendant shall forfeit to the United States a sum of money equal to the amount representing the total amount of proceeds the convicted defendant obtained as a result of the violations charged in this Information.

- 3. <u>Substitute Assets</u>: If the property described above as being subject to forfeiture, as a result of any act or omission of the defendant(s):
 - (a) Cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
 - (b) Has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party;
 - (c) Has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court;
 - (d) Has been substantially diminished in value; or
 - (e) Has been commingled with other property that cannot be subdivided without difficulty;

it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p) as incorporated by Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461, to seek to forfeit any other property of defendant(s) up to the value of the forfeitable property described above.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW SCHNEIDER United States Attorney

JOHN K. NEAL

Assistant United States Attorney Chief, White Collar Crimes Unit

CRAIG A. WEIER (P33261)

Assistant United States Attorney 211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001

Detroit, MI 48226

Phone: (313) 226-9678

E-mail: Craig.Weier@usdoj.gov

August 21, 2019



United States District Court Eastern District of Michigan	Criminal Case Cover S	Case:2:19-cr-20540			
NOTE: It is the responsibility of the Assistant U.S.	Attorney signing this form to complete it	Judge: Steeh, George Caram MJ: Whalen, R. Steven Filed: 08-21-2019 At 11:25 AM INFO USA V DAVID STRAND (LG)			
Companion Case Informatio	Comp	anion case warmed.			
This may be a companion case based upo	on LCrR 57.10 (b)(4)¹: Judge	Assigned:			
□Yes ⊠No	AUSA	's Initials:			
Case Title: USA v. U.S. v. D	Pavid Strand				
County where offense occurred : Oakland					
Check One: ⊠Felony	☐Misdemea	nor			
Indictment// Information no prior complaintIndictment/ Information based upon prior complaint [Case number:]Indictment/ Information based upon LCrR 57.10 (d) [Complete Superseding section below]					
Superseding Case Information	n				
Superseding to Case No: Judge:					
 ☐ Corrects errors; no additional charges or defendants. ☐ Involves, for plea purposes, different charges or adds counts. ☐ Embraces same subject matter but adds the additional defendants or charges below: 					
Defendant name	Charges	Prior Complaint (if applicable)			
Please take notice that the below listed Assistant United States Attorney is the attorney of record for the above captioned case.					
August 2 1, 2019 Date	Craig A. Weier Assistant United St 211 W. Fort Stree Detroit, MI 48226 Phone: (313) 226 Fax: (313) 226 E-Mail address: C Attorney Bar #:	et, Suite 2001 6-3277 -9678 -2873 raig.weier@usdoj.gov			

¹ Companion cases are matters in which it appears that (1) substantially similar evidence will be offered at trial, or (2) the same or related parties are present, and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence. Cases may be companion cases even though one of them may have already been terminated.